

Message

From: LEE, LILY [LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV]
Sent: 6/1/2018 12:22:04 AM
To: Chesnutt, John [Chesnutt.John@epa.gov]
Subject: FW: Curbed SF reporter questions - EPA response
Attachments: Parcel UC-2 RACR - excerpt re excavation of slope.pdf; Dean email 2004-7-20 - HPNS322 Draft Final.pdf; Rad Scanner Van Survey Rpt Sept 2002 09-156344.pdf

From: LEE, LILY

Sent: Tuesday, May 1, 2018 1:09 PM

To: 'Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO' <derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil>; Amy Brownell (amy.brownell@sfdph.org) <amy.brownell@sfdph.org>; 'McKinney, Kasheica (CII)' <kasheica.mckinney@sfgov.org>; 'Elizabeth Basinet' <elizabeth.basinet@NOREASINC.COM>; kellie.koenig@ch2m.com; 'Henderson, Kim/SDO' <Kimberly.Henderson@CH2M.com>; george.brooks@navy.mil; Janda, Danielle L CIV <danielle.janda@navy.mil>; 'juanita.bacey@dtsc.ca.gov' <juanita.bacey@dtsc.ca.gov>; Bill Franklin (william.d.franklin@navy.mil) <william.d.franklin@navy.mil>

Subject: Curbed SF reporter questions - EPA response

FYI, Here is the response our press officer sent to Chris Roberts, Curbed SF, on 4/26/18.

Q1: Will EPA explain why and how the "scanner van" would scan areas that were later remediated, including the utility corridors, as well as "areas of Parcel B, Parcel C, and minor portions of Parcels D and E," areas known to have contamination, and find nothing above background levels? Doesn't the van's failure to detect radioactive contamination in areas known to have contamination cast doubt on its results? If not, why not

A1. The scanner van technology is a "first look" at locating gamma emitting radionuclide contamination at or near the surface and is often used to prioritize more soil sampling for further radioanalyses. EPA did not base its decisions on how this site should be addressed based on the scanner van alone. Other forms of sampling and scanning provide additional useful information about potential contamination present at the site. As such, the later Records of Decision (RODs) required further excavation, sampling, and scanning.

The radiological scanner van survey gave information related to certain types of potential radiological exposures closer to the surface; it did not address all types of radiation potentially present or deeper locations of contamination. The scanner van survey is also subject to other limitations listed in the attached report, e.g. only limited locations were accessible, asphalt would have shielded gamma radiation, etc.

Q2: Additionally, where can I find out more about the "EPA health physicist [who] conducted an independent scan of the area to confirm that the former building site was clean"? When was this done? Will you provide documents, or explain where documents may be kept?

A2. Steve Dean is an EPA health physicist who performed an independent scan of the area in 2004. Attached please find his memo documenting his work.

Q3: Lastly: Whistleblower Anthony Smith has sworn in the petition sent to the NRC last year that he took what was meant to be a background sample of soil from Parcel A. This soil was tested and was found to have "2 to 3 picocuries per gram of cesium-137, which Smith knew was much higher than background levels and the cesium-137 cleanup standard of 0.113 picocuries per gram – 18 to 26 times higher than the set health and safety ceiling." According to Smith, the area where this sample was taken is near Building 101, where the commercial kitchen is today on Parcel A. Was this report

ever given to EPA? Did EPA or the Navy investigate? In any event, did EPA receive or is EPA party or privy to other reports or allegations of contamination on Parcel A?

A3: EPA has reviewed the petition, and multiple EPA staff have conducted field visits to the location that Mr. Smith indicated. This location was actually on Parcel UC-2, adjacent to Parcel A. In 2012, after Mr. Smith's reported sample collection occurred, the Navy removed all soil down to a depth of 2 feet below the surface (unless bedrock was encountered at a more shallow depth) and placed clean fill at this location as part of placement of a "durable cover" required across the entire site. This link gives documentation of this removal: http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/final_documents2?global_id=38440004&doc_id=60308702. Attached is a relevant excerpt for your convenience.

Q4: Does EPA have on file the shipment manifests for truckloads of soil removed from the shipyard? If so I would like to request some.

A4: The Navy is responsible for maintaining the full Administrative Record for the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard. Here is a link to the Navy's website about this site: https://www.bracpmo.navy.mil/brac_bases/california/former_shipyard_hunters_point.html

If you would like access to a document that is not available online, contact Derek Robinson: (619) 524-6026, derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil